

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/824,855	04/04/2001	Ching-Yu Chang	4425-130	9977	
7	590 01/30/2003				
LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP Suite 310 1700 Diagonal Road			EXAMINER		
			CULBERT, ROBERTS P		
Alexandria, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1763		

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					\mathcal{C}			
		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/824,8	555	CHANG, CHING-YU				
Offic	: Action Summary	Examin	r	Art Unit				
•		Roberts		1763				
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM								
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status 1)⊠ Respon	sive to communication(s) file	ed on Jan 3 2003						
		2b)⊠ This action is	s non-final					
• -	nis application is in condition	,		rosecution as to the meri	its is			
	n accordance with the practi				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
4) Claim(s)	1-28 is/are pending in the a	application.						
4a) Of the	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>17 and 18</u> is/are allowed.								
6)⊠ Claim(s)	1-16 and 19-28 is/are reject	ed.						
7) Claim(s)	is/are objected to.							
• —	are subject to restrict	tion and/or election	requirement.					
Application Paper								
	ification is objected to by the							
· =-	ing(s) filed on <u>April 1, 2001</u> is							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.								
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.								
,		by the Examiner.						
•	U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	for foreign priority	-d 25 1 C C S 110/a) (d) or (f)				
• –	edgment is made of a claim Some * c) None of:	ior loreign priority u	idei 33 0.3.0. 9 1 19(a	ij-(a) or (i).				
· —	•	focuments have bee	on received					
-	 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 							
			• •	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
_	 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
14) Acknowled	Igment is made of a claim fo	r domestic priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119(e	e) (to a provisional applic	cation).			
,	translation of the foreign land		· ·					
Attachment(s)	•	. •	•					
	nces Cited (PTO-892) erson's Patent Drawing Review (PT osure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pa			(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)	·			

Application/Control Number: 09/824,855

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed 01/03/02 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: There is no support in the specification for a limitation regarding the relative motion between the tank and the substrate, or the solution and the substrate.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant has argued that the method of Erk does not produce a rough surface as in the claimed invention and is therefore not a proper reference. The argument is not found persuasive because the surface is modified and a rough surface is produced as cited previously.

Applicant has argued that the claimed invention is not concerned with whether the bubbles are formed in the solution before the substrate is immersed and therefore distinguishes the claimed invention over the prior art. The argument is not found persuasive. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it makes no difference whether the bubbles are formed in the solution before or immediately after the substrate is immersed because the steps occur approximately at the same time and the surface treatment and results would be unaffected by this small discrepancy.

Art Unit: 1763

Applicant has argued that although the original specification does not recite the limitation that no relative motion between the substrate and the solution that the claimed invention recites the limitation inhehrently. The argument is not found persuasive because no evidence is provided from the specification to show inherency. Further, no evidence is provided that the results produced (i.e. rough surface) would be affected. Since the rotation suggested in Erk is quite slow, e.g. 1.5 rpm, one of ordinary skill would expect the result to be the same.

Allowable Subject Matter

The indicated allowability of original claims 5-7 and 11-16 is withdrawn in view of. U.S. Patent 4,956,035 to Sedlak and IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin Vol. 30, Issue 6, Page 244. While amended claims 5-7 and 11-16 are not rejected over the prior art, the claims as originally filed (i.e. without the new matter pointed out above) would be subject to rejection based on a combination of Erk in view of U.S. Patent 4,956,035 to Sedlak and IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin Vol. 30, Issue 6, Page 244.

Claims 17 and 18 are allowed.

Claims 1-16 and 19-28, as amended, are not rejected over the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Application/Control Newsor: 09/824,855

Art Unit: 1763

Claims 1-16 and 19-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no support in the specification for a limitation regarding the relative motion between the tank and the substrate, or the solution and the substrate.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberts Culbert whose telephone number is (703) 305-7965. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-4:00).

Application/Control Namber: 09/824,855

Art Unit: 1763

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on (703) 308-1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

January 21, 2003

GZEGURY MILLS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TOUNDLESY CLERER 1700